

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Permission is requested to substitute a replacement Figure 10 as marked in red ink on the attached copy of Figure 10.

Attachment: Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 10 and 12-62 now stand in the present application, claims 10, 12 and 29 having been amended, claims 11 and 21-28 having been canceled, and new claims 41-62 having been added. The Examiner's helpfulness and kindness at the interview of July 25, 2007 were greatly appreciated. The amendments to claims 10, 12 and 29 were discussed at the interview. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has noted at page 2 that certain antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter of independent claims 10, 11 and 29 is not provided in the specification and at page 4 of the Office Action the Examiner has objected to the specification for not providing proper antecedent basis for independent claims 10, 11 and 29. As noted above, claims 10 and 29 have been amended (and claim 11 has been canceled) and it is respectfully submitted that the amendments to the claims correct the antecedent basis problem noted by the Examiner.

More particularly, independent claims 10 and 29 now more clearly recite that the straight surfaces of each of the two uppermost tangs on either side of the center line bisecting each of the buckets define two points of a line that form an angle of  $25.78^\circ$  with the center line. This is clearly shown and described in the present specification at, *inter alia*, Figure 10 by angle E in which the line that forms the angle with the center line is shown to be formed from tangent lines along upper tangs 22 and 23 and which is described more clearly in amended paragraph 47 as amended above. In addition, Figure 10 has been amended to more clearly show that tangent lines  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  along the pressure faces of the bottommost tang 24 do not lie on the line which forms the

angle E of  $25.78^\circ$  with the center line. Thus, claims 10 and 29, as amended, together with the amendment to the specification and revised Figure 10 now provide suitable antecedent basis for these claims. Accordingly, the Examiner's objection to the specification is believed to have been overcome.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 10-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner's § 112, second paragraph, rejection of the claims is also believed to have been overcome by the amendments to independent claims 10 and 29, to the specification at paragraph 47 and in the revision of Figure 10 as discussed above. More particularly, these changes more clearly recite that it is two points that define the line which forms the angle E of  $25.78^\circ$  with the center line bisecting each of the buckets. The Examiner had interpreted the prior claim language to only define a single point which allowed adjustment of the line forming the angle E to virtually any location. As noted above, this has been clarified by the suitable amendments to independent claims 10 and 29 that establish that two points on each side of the center line define lines forming angle E. Accordingly, the Examiner's § 112, second paragraph, rejection of the claims is also believed to have been overcome.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United Kingdom Patent 677,142 (the '142 patent), has rejected claims 29-32 and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Webb, has rejected claims 10-13, 21 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '142 patent, in view of Applicants' prior art, has rejected claims 14-19, 22-24 and 26-27

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '142 patent and Applicants' prior art and further in view of Johnson, has rejected claims 20 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '142 patent and Applicants' prior art and further in view of Caruso, has rejected claims 31-40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the '142 patent in view of Johnson, has rejected claims 10-11, 13-17 and 21-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Webb in view of Applicants' prior art, has rejected claims 18-19 and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webb and Applicants' prior art and has rejected claims 20 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webb and Applicants' prior art and further in view of Caruso. Applicants respectfully traverse all of the Examiner's §§ 102 and 103 rejections of the claims.

None of the cited references teach or suggest the angular relationship now more clearly recited in independent claims 10 and 29, More particularly, independent claims 10 and 29 and their respective dependent claims now more clearly recite that the straight surfaces of each of the two uppermost tangs on either side of the center line bisecting each of the buckets define two points of a line that form an angle of  $25.78^{\circ}$  with the center line. This angular relationship provides a bucket and wheelpost configuration which reduces the number of buckets and wheelposts and which is wider and much more squat than any of the configurations or arrangements set forth in the cited art. Accordingly, claims 10 and 29 and their respective dependent claims are believed to patentably define over the cited references taken either singly or in any combination. The

dependent claims 12-28 and 30-40 are believed to further patentably define over and combination of the cited art, because they require further limitations that are also not taught or suggested by the cited references.


In order to more completely define Applicants' invention, Applicants have added new claims 41-62 which further recite specific configurations and arrangements of the buckets and wheelposts in Applicants' invention which are also not believed to be taught or suggested by any of the cited references, taken either singly or in any combination. For example, these newly added claims require yet other specific dimensional relationships between the tang and fillet configurations of the buckets and wheelposts of Applicants' inventions. Accordingly, all of the claims 41-62 are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Therefore, in view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all of claims 10, 12-20 and 29-62, now standing in the application, be allowed and that the case be passed to issue. If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a supplemental response or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone exchange indicated below.

**LAGRANGE et al.**  
Appl. No. 10/774,399  
August 14, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By:   
Chris Comuntzis  
Reg. No. 31,097

CC:Imr  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100